

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

ANDRE BISASOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No:1:23-cv-374-JL-TSM

CRAIG S. DONAIS, RUSSELL F. HILLIARD,
DONAIS LAW OFFICES, PLLC, UPTON &
HATFIELD, LLP AND MARY K. DONAIS,

Defendants.

**DONAIS DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
SANCTIONS AGAINST DONAIS DEFENDANTS (DOC. 199)**

Defendants, Craig Donais, Donais Law Offices PLLC and Mary K. Donais (collectively “Donais Defendants”), by and through their counsel, Morrison Mahoney LLP, respectfully submit this Objection to Plaintiff’s Motion for Sanctions Against Donais Defendants (Doc. 199), stating in support as follows:

1. On May 9, 2024, Plaintiff filed his Motion for Sanctions Against the Donais Defendants, seeking sanctions for the "false" statement that Donais was not served with process in a Massachusetts Superior Court matter. This motion largely mirrors a portion of his motion for limited discovery, also filed on May 9, 2024. (Doc. 197.) Plaintiff contends that the Donais Defendants “misstated the facts regarding the underlying reason for dismissal in the related Middlesex superior court case.” (Doc. 199, ¶2.) He then cites to the portion of the argument within Donais Defendants’ Objection to Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend to which he takes issue and claims Craig Donais lied to another court. (Doc. 199, ¶¶3-5 and fn1.)

2. Plaintiff then argues facts related to the Massachusetts matter, states that this issue related to the Massachusetts matter is “critical,” and requests an evidentiary hearing. (Doc. 199, ¶¶6-15.) He further asks this court to issue a “finding of fact” related to the service of process issue in another jurisdiction. (Doc. 199, ¶16.)

3. Plaintiff then seeks sanctions to include a default judgment. (Doc. 199, ¶23.)

4. The Donais Defendants deny any “lies” to any court, and object to essentially litigating a disputed fact in a Massachusetts matter in this court. To the extent Plaintiff disagrees with the Middlesex Superior Court docket sheet (Doc. 168-1), he is free to address said disagreement in a reply to the Donais Defendants’ Objection to Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend his complaint. Beyond that, Plaintiff’s allegations do not rise to the level of warranting sanctions, much less an evidentiary hearing and/or a default judgment.

5. Plaintiff’s motion should be denied, and no sanctions imposed.

Wherefore Craig Donais, Mary K. Donais and Donais Law Offices PLLC respectfully request that this Honorable Court:

- A. Deny Plaintiff’s Motion for Sanctions Against Donais Defendants; and
- B. Grant such other and further relief as is equitable and just.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig S. Donais, Donais Law Offices, PLLC and
Mary K. Donais

MORRISON MAHONEY LLP

By /s/ Linda M. Smith
Edwin F. Landers, Jr., #17297
elanders@morrisonmahoney.com
Linda M. Smith, #265038
lsmith@morrisonmahoney.com
Center of New Hampshire Office Tower
650 Elm Street, Suite 201
Manchester, NH 03101

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served on the following persons on this date in the manner specified herein:

Electronically Served:

/s/ Linda M. Smith
Linda M. Smith, #265038